

reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts the agency to the reviewer's position and contentions.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, 435 U.S. 519, 533 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon v. Hodel*, 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris*, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concern on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviews may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in its programs on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, and marital or familial status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternatives means of communication of program information (braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint, write the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250, or call 1-800-245-6340 (voice) or 202-720-1127 (TDD). USDA is an equal employment opportunity employer.

Dated: December 11, 1997.

Bradley Burmark,

Deputy District Ranger.

[FR Doc. 97-33346 Filed 12-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

Posting of Stockyards

Pursuant to the authority provided under Section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 202), it was ascertained that the livestock market named below is a stockyard as defined by Section 302 (a). Notice was given to the stockyard owner and to the public as required by Section 302 (b), by posting notices at the stockyard on the date specified below, that the stockyard is subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 181 *et seq.*).

| Facility No., name, and location of stockyard | Date of posting |
|---|---------------------|
| PA-159, Troy Sales, Troy, Pennsylvania. | September 17, 1997. |

Done at Washington, D.C. this 12th day of December 1997.

Daniel L. Van Ackeren,

Director, Livestock Marketing Division, Packers and Stockyards Programs.

[FR Doc. 97-33331 Filed 12-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-824]

Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products From Japan: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Order

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of final results of changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review, and revocation in part of antidumping duty order.

SUMMARY: On November 10, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published a notice of initiation of a changed circumstances antidumping duty administrative review and preliminary results of review with intent to revoke, in part, the

antidumping duty order on certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan. We are now revoking this order in part, with respect to corrosion-resistant steel flat products with certain dimensions and coatings, based on the fact that domestic parties have expressed no interest in the importation or sale of this product, imported from Japan.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 22, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gideon Katz or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-5255 and (202) 482-3020, respectively.

The Applicable Statute and Regulations: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as codified at 19 CFR by Part 351, 62 FR 27295 (May 19, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 19, 1997, Sudo Corporation (Sudo) requested that the Department conduct a changed circumstances administrative review to determine whether to partially revoke the order with regard to imports of certain corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products from Japan. The order with regard to imports of other types of corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products is not affected by this request. On October 28, 1997, domestic producers AK Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Inland Steel Industries, Inc., LTV Steel Company, Inc., National Steel Corporation, and U.S. Steel Group, a unit of USX Corporation, informed the Department in writing that they did not object to the changed circumstances review and had no interest in the importation or sale of electrolytic zinc-coated steel coiled rolls produced in Japan as described in detail in Sudo's letter.

We preliminarily determined that domestic producers' affirmative statement of no interest constituted changed circumstances sufficient to warrant a partial revocation of this order. Consequently, on November 10, 1997, the Department published a notice of initiation and preliminary results of